

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application with claims 11-13 and 15-17 presently being withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 3-17 are amended and claim 18 is added. Claims 1 and 14 are amended to address the cited references. Withdrawn independent claim 15 is amended to maintain consistency with claims 1 and 14. Claims 4-7, 16 and 17 are amended for antecedent basis. Additionally, claims 7-13 are amended to correct typographical errors therein.

No new matter is added to the application by this Amendment. Support for the language added to claims 1, 14 and 15 can be found in claim 3, as originally filed and within the present specification at paragraphs [0039]-[0041]. New claim 18 also finds support in the specification at paragraphs [0039]-[0041].

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Maples in the December 4, 2007 interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 7-10 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over JP-2002-029701 (JP '701).

The Patent Office alleges that JP '701 discloses all limitations recited in claims 1 and 14. Additionally, the Patent Office apparently alleges that the deodorizer-zinc oxide of the

deodorization section 28 of JP '701 is equivalent to or the same as the odorant treatment portion as recited in claims 1 and 14.

Nowhere does JP '701 teach or suggest use of a carrier having a porous adsorbent for adsorbing the odorant contained in the mixed gas and a decomposition catalyst for promoting decomposition of the odorant of the adsorbed odorant.

Amended claims 1 and 14 require that the odorant treatment portion includes a carrier for treating the odorant, wherein the carrier carries a porous adsorbent for adsorbing the odorant contained in the mixed gas and a catalyst for promoting decomposition of the odorant adsorbed in the porous adsorbent. Nowhere does JP '701 teach or suggest that the alleged odorant treatment portion (deodorizer-zinc oxide of the deodorization section 28) has a carrier that carries a porous adsorbent and a decomposition catalyst together as recited in claims 1 and 14.

In view of the foregoing, JP '701 fails to disclose each and every limitation of independent claims 1 and 14 and thus cannot anticipate claims 1 and 14, or any of the additional features recited in the dependent claims thereof. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over JP '701 in view of both DE-10115220 (DE '220) and U.S. Patent No. 6,294,276 to Ogino. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Patent Office acknowledged that JP '701 does not teach the specific porous adsorbents and the particular catalyst. The Patent Office introduced DE '220 as allegedly disclosing a zeolite or active carbon used to remove sulfur from a hydrogen rich gas stream. The Patent Office also introduced Ogino as allegedly disclosing use of palladium to purify hydrogen before the hydrogen is fed to a fuel cell.

Neither DE '220 nor Ogino remedy the deficiencies of JP '701 as described above with respect to claim 1, from which claims 2-6 depend, because nowhere does DE '220 and/or Ogino teach or suggest use of a carrier having a porous adsorbent for adsorbing the odorant contained in the mixed gas together with a decomposition catalyst for promoting decomposition of the odorant of the adsorbed odorant.

DE '220 fails to teach use of a porous adsorbent along with a decomposition catalyst. Ogino merely teaches the use of palladium for selective permeation of hydrogen, and nowhere suggests either (1) the not use of palladium (Pd) with porous adsorbents or (2) the use of Pd as possibly acting as a catalyst in decomposing sulfur adsorbed by porous adsorbents. At best, Ogino teaches the use of Pd instead of the adsorber of JP '701, not in conjunction with the adsorber.

None of JP '701, DE '220 and Ogino, taken singly or in combination, teach or suggest an odorant treatment portion that includes a carrier for treating the odorant, wherein the carrier carries a porous adsorbent for adsorbing the odorant contained in the mixed gas and a catalyst for promoting decomposition of the odorant adsorbed in the porous adsorbent as recited in independent claim 1.

Thus, Applicants assert that even if DE '220 and/or Ogino were to have been combined with JP '701 as alleged by the Patent Office, the deficiencies of JP '701 as described above with respect to claim 1 would not have been remedied.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

IV. New Claim

In addition to the above, none of the cited references teach or suggest that a carrier of an odorant treatment portion has a roll structure or a honeycomb structure as required in new claim 18. At best, Ogino discloses that (1) the hydrogen separation film 42 includes a film

base that is composed of porous ceramics, porous glass, or the like and is coated with palladium or palladium alloy and (2) the coat of palladium or palladium alloy is formed as a dense film without pinholes. However, Ogino does not teach or suggest that the film base or dense film has a roll structure or a honeycomb structure.

V. Rejoinder

Applicants further respectfully submit that, because claims 1-10 and 14 are in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above, claims 11-13 and 15-17 should be rejoined and similarly allowed as all withdrawn claims include the allowable subject matter of the elected claims. Thus, withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement and rejoinder of claims 11-13 and 15-17 are respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Brian C. Anscomb
Registration No. 48,641

JAO:BCA/bca

Date: December 21, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--